

---

# Imprimatur,

Liber cui Titulus, *A Plain Answer to a Popish Priest*, &c. Juxta hoc exemplar ab Autore recognitum una cum adjuncto Tractatulo cui Titulus, *An Answer to the Oxford Animadverter*.

July 31.  
1688.

H. Maurice, Rmo in Christo  
P. D. Wilhelmo Archiepis  
Cant. a Sacris.

---

---

# Imprimatur,

Liber cui Titulus, *A Plain Answer to a Popish Priest*, &c. Juxta hoc exemplar ab Autore recognitum una cum adjuncto Tractatulo cui Titulus, *An Answer to the Oxford Animadverter*.

July 31.  
1688.

H. Maurice, Rmo in Christo  
P. D. Wilhelmo Archiepis  
Cant. a Sacris.

---

A  
Plain Answer  
TO A  
Popish = Priest,  
Questioning the  
Orders of the Church of England.

---

Drawn up for the Satisfaction of his Parishioners,  
By a Minister of that Church.

---

*The Second EDITION, from the Author's  
own Correct Copy.*

---

To which is now Annext, An  
A N S W E R  
TO THE  
*Oxford Animadverter's Reflections upon it.*  
By the same Author.

---

L O N D O N:  
Printed for Samuel Smith at the Princes Arms in St. Paul's  
Church-Yard. MDCLXXXIX.

Plain Answer

to the

Charge of

the

Rev. Mr. [illegible]

of the

Church of England

in the

Year 1711

By [illegible]



---

---

A  
Plain Answer  
TO A  
POPISH PRIEST, &c.

I Know nothing that useth to be objected against our Orders, but that either,

1. We have not a true Succession of Bishops. Or
2. No true form of Orders. Or
3. That our Ordainers are Schismatics, or Hereticks, and so cannot ordain: for as for that ridiculous silly exploded Story of the *Nags-head Ordination*, it requires a very hard Forehead at this time of day to own it, when We have so often prov'd from Authentick Records, that *Archbishop Parker* was ordain'd in the Chappel at *Lambeth* by more than three Bishops, and all his Brethren accordingly, agreeable to the *Canons* of the Ancient Church: and if this be deny'd, I will be at any time responsible for an *Authentick Copy* of those Records.

Now to the first Objection, *That we have no true Succession*; I answer,

1. That there is a *double Succession*, of *Doctrine*, and of *Persons*; as to the Succession of *Doctrine*, We have better proofs than they; We believing all that hath been believ'd by the *Catholick Church of Christ* as necessary to Salvation,

while the *Romanists* have introduc'd too many both Doctrines and Practices unknown to Antiquity.

2. That as to the Succession of Persons,

1. That proves nothing without Succession of Doctrines; for many of the *Heretical Churches*, as the *Romanists* account them, of the *East*, can shew as good a Succession as they can at *Rome*.

2. We have had such a Succession from the very foundation of our Church; and if it be objected, that We cannot shew a compleat Catalogue of the Names of our Bishops:

1. We say it is not necessary; For must there have been no Burgesses sent from any Towns in *England* to Parliament, because, as I suppose, no man can show a List of the Names of all the several Persons that serv'd there for every Town since the first Institution? And were there no Kings in many parts of the World, because we cannot give an account who was the first, and the second, &c?

2. Some of the Churches, to whom the *Romanists* allow a Succession, cannot shew compleat Catalogues, as the Churches of *Theffalonica*, *Ephesus*, *Philippi*, *Corinth*, *Smyrna*, &c. and yet no man denys that they have Episcopal Succession amongst them.

3. Nor is the Succession of the *Roman Church* so undoubted as They would make it; for it is questionable whether *St. Peter* were ever Bishop of *Rome* (in the true Ecclesiastical sense of the Word) nor can their best Authors to this day tell us who were his immediate Successors; and among them, how many of their *Chronologists* have made two Men, and two Popes of One? (for *Cletus* and *Anacletus* were undoubtedly the same Person) and if we consider how many Anti-Popes there were in the times of the great Schisms, under which that Church labour'd, and that there are many differences between the *French* and *Italian Writers* about the number of their Popes, and who were

were the true Successors of *St. Peter*, the *French* acknowledging the *Anti-Popes* of *Avignon*. ( And the Princes of each Country, during those Schisms, embracing the Interests of that Pope who was of greatest use and advantage to them ) and how many vacancies there were, when they had no Pope at all, we have no great reason to depend so much on their Succession. And whereas

4. The *Fathers*, to prove Hereticks to be men but of yesterday, and to have no true Succession from the Apostles ( as *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Austin*, *Optatus*, &c. ) instance in the Succession of the Church of *Rome*, we are to remember that they were *Western* Fathers, and so thought fit, as it was most proper, to instance in the Succession of the *Western Patriarch*; not but that other Churches could plead the same Succession, but that this *Patriarchal* See was the nearest at hand: and they withal declare, That they could with the same Reason instance in the Succession of other *Patriarchs*, whose Seats *Tertullian* calls *Mother-Churches*, as well as *Rome*.

The second Objection is, *That we have no true form of Orders; and that none can confer that on another, which he hath not himself.* To which I answer in general, That if that Aphorism be true, then an Infidel, that baptizeth, cannot give Baptism, because he himself is not baptiz'd; and yet the *Roman* Church allows such Baptism to be valid in case of Necessity.

But in particular we say,

1. That neither Christ nor his Apostles instituted any form of Words; and if Christ did not institute any form of Words, then *Orders* are not a Sacrament, from their own Principles; for to every Sacrament is required, as they say, an outward Sign, and an inward Grace, and a form of Words to convey that Grace: for I should be glad to meet that Man who would show me, that any one else but Christ can institute a Sacrament, or that our Saviour delivered

livered the *Holy Vessels*, ( the Paten and Chalice ) to the Apostles, and gave them power to offer Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead.

2. We keep that Matter and Form which the Apostolical Church us'd in giving *Orders*, viz. Imposition of Hands, and Prayer, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. *Acts* 6. 6. chap. 13. 3.

3. Many of the *Romish* Church allow this to be sufficient.

1. In the Case of the *Greek Church*, whose *Orders* they allow to be valid, though they use not the *Roman Form*. And

2. For this Reason *F. Walsh, Sancta Clara*, and some others of the *Roman Church* allow our *Orders* to be good.

4. We are sure that our Matter and Form is not only agreeable to the Apostolical Writings, but to the Practice of the Ancient Church. *St. Chrysostom*, Hom. 14. in Act. says, *This is Ordination, The hand of Man is imposed, but God worketh All, and it is his Hand that toucheth the Head of him that is Ordained.* Nor can the *Romanists* themselves shew us any such Matter as *Theirs* is, of touching the Vessels deputed to the use of the Blessed Eucharist, or Form, as that of their Church, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost*, &c. with a Power to make the Body of Christ till above 800 years after our Saviour's time.

The third Objection is, *Your Church is Schismatical and Heretical, and so cannot confer Orders.*

To which we answer, That the Charge is unjust, and that in truth the Heresie and Schism lies at the door of the Church of *Rome*; and if their Argument be good, let them consider how they will be able to vindicate themselves. But take the Charge for granted:

1. The Ordination of Hereticks and Schismaticks was lookt upon to be valid in the Primitive Church.

2. The *Greeks* are accounted by the *Romanists* not only Schismaticks, but Hereticks, as well as we, and yet their Priests

Priests are not re-ordain'd; nay, many *Greeks* are sent from the *Seminary* at *Rome* to be ordain'd by those Schismatical and Heretical Bishops in the *East*.

3. If no *Orders* given by a Heretick be valid, what becomes of their own, among whom so many *Popes* were Heretical, *Liberius* an *Arian*, *Honorius* a *Monothelite*, *John* the 22d in some Points a *Sadduce*, &c?

4. If *Orders* be, as they reckon, a Sacrament, and the Sacraments give an indelible Character, where is that indelible Character, (*Conc. Florent. in Unione, & Trident. Sess. 7. c. 9.*) If he who was once duly order'd a Bishop, when he turns, as they call it, Heretick, cannot give Orders?

5. Many of their Authors do say, That bare laying on of Hands, without using any Words at all, is giving of Orders; and some, That the Pope's saying, *Be Thou a Priest*, is sufficient: as if a Man should say, that sprinkling a Child were baptizing it, when the Minister said never a Word; Or that saying, *Be Thou a Christian*, were sufficient to make it such, without sprinkling the Child, or dipping it in Water. And

6. At last, to make the most of it, and to take it for granted, which we ought not, that our Bishops were Schismatics and Heretics, what is said by them of Laymens Baptism, and such like Cases, will be pleaded for this, *What ought not to be done, is valid when it is done*, i. e. it ought not to be reiterated, because there is an indelible Character given.

And when they Object that we had our *Orders* from them, and yet have left them, it is easily answered,

1. That we had our *Orders* from them, as they from the Apostles; and we have separated no farther from them, than they from the Apostles.

2. That this doth not make us any more beholding to them, for handing down our *Orders* to us, than they are

to the *Jews*, for handing down the Scriptures of the Old Testament to them ; All being owing, not to the Charity of the Men, but to the wise Providence and Goodness of God, who hath so taken care of his Church.

To all which I subjoyn, That we have a greater assurance of the validity of our *Orders*, than they can have of theirs.

1. Because they make the *Intention* of the Priest necessary to every Sacrament, and amongst the Sacraments they reckon *Orders* ; (*Council of Trent, Sess. 7. Can. 11.*) and we know, that no Man can be sure of another Man's Intentions ; and have been told, that some of their Bishops have confess'd, that whenever they gave *Orders*, they never intended to make a Priest.

2. Because, if the Person *Ordained*, or *Ordaining*, be *Simoniacal* ; if the Pope, who made the Bishop, be so, or there were no just Intention when either of them were baptized, and so upward to the first Priest or Bishop who gave *Baptism* or *Orders*, then all that is done by such Men is by their own Doctrine invalid.

---

A N  
**A N S W E R**  
 TO THE  
*Oxford Animadverter's Reflections*  
 On the  
**FOREGOING PAPER,**  
 In a L E T T E R  
 TO  
*T. R. G. H. D. D. D. W.*

---

*Nihil veritas erubescit, nisi solummodo abscondi.*  
 Tertul. adv. Valent. n. 52.

---

S I R,

**I** Was much surpriz'd, that the imperfect, and un-*Self. 1.*  
 correct Paper, written by a Hand, which you  
 knew, was not mine, and which at best could pre-  
 tend to be no more, but a *Cursory Essay* sent you  
 for your private View, should be so hastily, with-  
 out consulting the Author, sent to the Press; for had your  
 Intentions been communicated to me, I should have ta-  
 ken care to have sent you such a Copy, ( with such Notes,  
 and Explanations ) as should have saved my furious Ad-



versary the trouble of exposing himself, while he studies to assault an Unknown Antagonist, who hath learnt long since to despise such weak, and unmanly Efforts of a Passion destin'd to supply the want of Argument, and which offers Protection to a baffled Cause, that is not able by other Reasons to defend itself.

§. 2.

Nor are such Methods to be wondred at; for of late there hath appear'd a *Classis of Men*, whose Talent lies in Assurance, and bold Affirmations, in running down their Adversaries with loud Clamours, and Noise; in disowning plain Matters of Fact themselves, and requiring others to prove Negatives; who can outface *Records*, and challenge *Originals* of Forgery; while *Constantine's Donation*, and the many *Chartularies* of the *Benedictines* (and other *Orders*) must not be controverted, (among all which attempts of theirs, I wonder, they had not in so many Ages shown us a Deed under our blessed Saviour's own Hand and Seal for the *Supremacy of St. Peter and his Successors*) but perhaps the men, who have skill in foisting into the World such Writings, are most suspicious, that they shall meet with the same dealing; and it may be pardonable to them, when the Cause is desperate, to fall in *Love* with *Raillery*, and please themselves with little Boasts, and to assault a single Sheet never destin'd for the Publick, while the *Representer* hath deserted his Post, and so many excellent Treatises written by our Divines against their Church, are to this day unanswer'd.

§. 3

And had I not learnt at this time of day not to wonder at any thing, I should have been astonisht at the modern way of managing Controversies: to omit their unmanly Language, that serves instead of *Syllogism*, they have a peculiar talent of denying, that the Sun shines. Shew them what their most celebrated Authors affirm, they deny it to be the Sense of their *Church* (though their *Church* hath never condemn'd those Doctrines, nor their Authors, but on the  
contrary



contrary *Canoniz'd* some, and *preferr'd* the rest. ) Shew them the *Decrees* of their *Councils*, for deposing Heretical Princes, &c. they either tell you, they were *Decrees* of *Councils*, but not decreed *Conciliarly*, or that *Councils* may err in *Matter of Fact*, or that their Decisions do not bind, but in *Matters of Faith*, ( and what those Articles are, themselves only know, for if *General Councils* cannot explain Articles of Faith, I know not who can ) or that no *Canons* bind, but what are enforce'd with an *Anathema* at the end of them, as if that word were of the Essence of a *Conciliar Sanction*.

Shew them the Decisions of their *Popes*, even the *Jesuites* themselves are now ready to grant, that the *Pope* may Err, that the *Infallibility* hath left *St. Peter's Chair*, that they have Usurpt upon the Rights of Princes, ( and should have said, of Bishops too, but that they are no Friends to the *Order* ) and to maintain their Usurpations, have falsified even their very *Missal*; and to conclude this Paragraph, whatever you can prove against them out of their most applauded Writers as to their Doctrines, or Practices, is not the Doctrine of their Church at present. § 4.

" *Transubstantiation*, and the *Real Presence* are the same thing with them now; the *Corporeal*, and *Spiritual Presence* of Christ in the Sacrament, the same; the Prayers directed to Saints in Heaven, and our desires offered to a Friend alive, and present with us, the same; the *Popes* Supremacy but a *Primacy*, his Authority over Princes but *Directive*, not *Coercive*, his *Infallibility* derived to all *Roman Catholics*, so that they share equally in it, by the *Blackloists* in their Notion of *Tradition*, &c. As if they had liberty to deal with their own *Popes*, and *Councils*, as the *Synod at Constance* did with our Blessed Saviour's Institution, who took away the *Cup* from the Laity, and abrogated the Precept ( *Drink ye all of it* ) with a *Non obstante* to our holy Master's express Command.

§. 5.

I shall not consider the Gentleman's *Conclusions*, arm'd, with which he enters the Lists against those two great Men now with God, Archbishop *Brambal*, and Dr. *Hammond*, ( and none but a fierce *Aggressor*, durst attack a dead Man ) and which seem to me to be built on these two Propositions, 1. That *our Church* did always agree with that of *Rome*, and was subject to it. 2. That no just cause may be given for any *Church*, that hath communicated with the Church of *Rome*, to separate from it ; both which Propositions are notoriously false. For I intend particularly to advert to his *Animadversions* on the Author of the *Plain Answer*, &c. When he Treats with a picquancy of Wit, and a fineness of Style, that is peculiar to him, while I must profess, that I never yet understood, how buffonery can be reconciled to the sober way of managing the Controversies, which too unhappily divide *Christendom* ; but this *Author's* little Treatise hath its Beauties, that no one envies it ; its Meen, and Air are haughty, and contemptuous, and I know not any good man, who will be his Competitor for such Accomplishments.

§. 6.

For which reason it would not be necessary to take notice of his very obliging Character of the Author of the *Paper*, &c. ( whom he calls *Poor man*, *Pamphleteer*, *Minister*, and no *Divine*, &c. besides frequent insinuations, that he hath *neither Learning, nor Honesty*. ) Were it not, that I would take this occasion to assure the World ; that I forgive him, that I never imagin'd a bad Argument could be helpt out of the Mire by hard Words, and sharp Reflections, and above all, that neither the *Morals*, nor *Religion* of the ( *pretended* ) *Infallible Church* will gain the greater Esteem in Mens Minds ; because the most applauded *Casuits* of that Communion ( the *Jesuits* ) have averr'd, \* That a man may lay to his Enemies Charge, as many Crimes, of which he is not Guilty, as will serve to make the Slanderer's Defence, and that, who so does thus, does

\* Talm-  
bourin lib.  
9. decal. c.  
2. Sect. 2.  
B. 4.

not sin against Justice, nor is bound to Restitution. But this is not all, for they affirm, \* *That a Man may kill his Enemy, or whoever does him wrong, though his Enemy dye in Mortal Sin, and shall undoubtedly be Damned.* And it is no wonder, if the Disciples of such Doctors do not stick at ill Words, when an Adversary is concern'd. But the hard Language is not all; there is a sort of Justice due to an Enemy, which obliges, as to treat his Person with Civility, so to state his Objections ingenuously, representing them candidly, and giving them what force belongs to them: which Rules, how this Gentleman, who is my Antagonist, hath followed, his *Innuendo's* are plain demonstration.

\* Molin. de  
justit. com-  
mut. tr. 3.  
dist. 13. n.  
1. Amic.  
ro. 5. de  
justit & ju-  
re dist. 36.  
sect. 5. n.  
85.

He calls it, §. 1. a *Forgery*, that our *Romish Adversaries* use to object against our Orders, that our Ordainers were *Hereticks, or Schismatics, and so could not Ordain.* But I averr it again, that it hath been usually objected, though not in their late Books of Controversie; yet by some of their Priests, particularly by one of that Communion, in answer to whom the *Plain Answer* was written. Now what *Forgery* is it to lay down fairly the Objections of an Adversary, as himself states them, and then to answer them. I cannot help it, if their Priests urge such Arguments as will not hold Water, and the *Church of Rome* doth not allow of. Am I bound to make an Apology for their Ignorance and Mistakes? and yet, should I have neglected to have given an Answer to the Objection, I well know, who would have made his Boasts of a Victory. How comes this Gentleman to tell me, how I should relate a Matter of Fact, which I well knew, while he was at the distance of many Miles from the place? If he hath this knack of making himself present in many places at once, I shall be the more easily perswaded to believe *Transubstantiation.*

§ 7.

And yet at last he may keep the *hard Forehead* to himself, when he averrs, ( *ibid.* ) *That Papists never argue from the Schism, or Herefie of the Ordainer, that the*

§. 8.

*Power*

*Power of conferring Orders is null.* For either their Church of this Age is not of the same mind with the *Roman Church* of former Ages, or my Adversary hath either forgotten, or is ignorant, how much that question was formerly disputed among their *Popes* and *Schoolmen*, *Whether Ordinations were void, and to be reiterated, that were made by Heretics, Schismatics, Excommunicate Persons, or Persons degraded, (or as \* Angelus de Clavasio words it, Utrum Episcopus, qui resignavit Episcopatu, vel degradatus, hæreticus, aut excommunicatus est, conferre possit ordines)* upon which subject the learned † *Morinus* is very large, and plainly shews, that the *Master of the Sentences* knew not, what to make of the Controversie; and that *Hugo de S. Victore* was of opinion, *That Heretics could not consecrate the Sacrament of the Eucharist, because they were not rightly Ordain'd.* And of this opinion is *Gratian*; and *Gul. Parisiensis* says the same of Bishops, that are degraded; and *Ostiensis* says, it was the opinion of the Ancients, (*Quid ergo, si quis Episcopus à Schismatico fuerit ordinatus? dixerunt antiqui, quod nulla est talis consecratio; & ideo non confert ordines taliter consecratus;*) *That no Schismatic Bishop could confer valid Orders.*

§ 9. If therefore their own Church hath been a long time troubled with this Controversie, with what a peculiar Air is it said, *That Papists never argue from the Schism, or Heresie of the Ordainer, that the Power of conferring Orders is null.* And if it be said, that the Papists of the present Age do not say so, I answer, 1. As above, that it hath been so said, and if all the Men of his Church be not of this Gentleman's mind, I cannot help that. 2. If the present Church differs from the Antient in so material a point as this is of the *Validity of Orders*, (on which depends the *Efficacy of the Eucharist*, and the *Remission of Sins*) Where is their *Infallibility*, or the *Indefectible, Unalterable Tradition of the Roman Church*?

And

And because he calls this a *meer Fiction*, I will shew, § 11.  
that in his own *Church* formerly *Ordinations made by Hæretics, Schismatics, Bishops deposed, Simoniacs, Bishops removed from one See to another, Bishops admitted to the highest Orders without some due time interposed between their entering into the several previous Orders were vacated*, and that, not only with respect to the *Exercise of their Function*, but with respect to their *Character*.

And first, for *Ordinations made by Hæretical Bishops*; § 12.  
the persons so ordain'd, have been reordained by order of *Popes* and their *Councils*. *Pope Urban the Second*, in \* his *Epistle to Peter, Bishop of Pistoia, &c.* (which is made <sup>\* Conc. To. 10. & c. 1. q. 7. c. 24.</sup> a part of their *Canon-Law*) says, "That whereas *Daibertus* had been ordain'd by *Nezelo Archbishop of Mentz*, " (who is said by the *Pope* to have been an *Hæretic, Schismatic, and Excommunicate*) He reordained the same "*Daibertus* a *Deacon*; and afterward made him *Bishop of Pisa*, and that for two Reasons according to the Sentence of two *Popes*, *Innocent*, and *Damasus*. 1. Because *Nezelo, quia nihil habuit*, &c. could not confer " that on another, which he had not himself. 2. Because " whatever was ill done, ought to be reiterated; so that these *Maxims*, which *Urban* allows of, exclude not only the execution of the *Power*, but the very *Power*, and *Character* itself, affirming, That *Hæretics* neither give the *Character*, nor confer *Grace*, when they give *Orders*.

And for small faults, or none at all, was a *Bishop* ac- § 13.  
counted a *Hæretic*, in the middle Ages of the *Church*. In the days of † *Ivo, Bishop of Chartres*, We read of a *Hæresy de Investiturâ*, " That whoever accepted of a Bi- † *Ivo. Canon. ep. 238. &c.*  
shopric from a *Lay-man*, and was invested therewith by " the delivery of a *Staffe*, or *Ring*, or such like, was a " *Hæretic*; and for that reason excommunicate by *Pope Paschal the Second*. And an old *Manuscript* which Monsieur \* *Not. in loc. in p. 252.*  
\* *Juret* saw, says, That this very *Crime*, as it is called, of

*Investiture* was adjudg'd *Hærese* in the Council of *Vienne*, in the days of *Pope Paschal*. And yet, so different were the Sentiments of the *Roman Church*, that though for the most part, such *Bishops*, and *Popes* were lookt on as no *Bishops*; yet *Clement* the Second, a *Saxon*, made *Bishop* of *Bamberg* by the Emperour *Henry*, and after that a *Schismatical Anti-Pope*, is both by *Baronius*, and *Binnius*, by *Caranza*, and *Bucher*, by *Labbeé*, and *Cossart* reckoned among the true *Popes*.

§ 14.  
† Concil.  
Lateran. 3.  
c. 2. apud  
Morin. ub.  
supr. p. 76.

Nor were *Schismatics* otherwise dealt with. *Pope Lucius* the Third reordain'd those, who had been ordain'd by the *Anti-Pope Octavian*; and of this mind were his Predecessors, † *Innocent* the Second, and *Alexander* the Third, and this manner of proceeding was allowed of in a *Synod* at *Venice*, and in another at *Northuse*.

§ 15.

And after the same manner, and for the same reasons were the Ordinations of *Bishops Excommunicate*, and *Deposed* vacated. As to *Excommunicate* Persons, it is the Decree of the *Synod* of *Quedlenburg*, under *Gregory* the Seventh, one of the greatest of their *Popes*, and (in the Esteem of a certain Society) one of the greatest of their *Saints*, that all the Ordinations, &c. of *Excommunicate Persons* are adjudg'd to be void, by the Determinations of the *Popes*, *Innocent*, *Leo*, *Pelagius*, &c. and if the Orders of *Excommunicate* Persons were lookt on as no Orders, much more the Ordinations of Persons Degraded; of which sort was *Ebbo* Archbishop of *Rhemes*, who for his Treasonable Practices against the Emperour *Louis*, was in the *Synod* of *Thionville* deposed; but under *Lothaire*, the Son of *Louis*, was restored by the Suffrage of some *Bishops*, till *Lothaire* was routed, and then *Ebbo* fled with him, *Hincmar* being made Archbishop in his stead, who vacated all the Orders of all the *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, who had been Ordain'd by *Ebbo* after his Deposition; because, as *Hincmar* thought, he had no Power of Ordaining.



ing. ( The *Acts* of which *Synod*, saith \* *Flodoard*, were con- \* *Flodo-*  
 firmed by *Pope Benedict* ) Particularly , *Halduinus* ha- ard. *Hist.*  
 ving been Ordain'd a Deacon by him, and afterward a Rem. l. 3.  
*Presbyter* by *Lupus* Bishop of *Chaaon*, it was decreed, c. 114.  
 that he could not be a *Presbyter*, because not rightly Or-  
 dain'd a Deacon. It is true, that *Pope Benedict's* Succe-  
 sor was of another mind, but the Controversie lasted at  
 least twenty seven years, says *Morinus*. And it is obser-  
 vable, that this Deposition ( and consequently the invalida-  
 ting the *Orders* given by *Ebbo* ) was for Treason against  
 his Prince ; and had all the *Popes* been Deposed, who ei-  
 ther took up Arms, or encouraged others to do so against  
 the Emperors of the *East*, or *West*, who were their So-  
 vereigns, what a Succession had we had in *St. Peter's* own  
 Chair?

Such also was the condition of *Simoniacs* ( and in what § 16.  
 a raking then were many of the *Popes* themselves, who  
 bought *St. Peter's* Chair, either with Money, or Fawning,  
 or other worse Services unbecoming that See :) For, for this  
 reason did a *Synod* at *Placenza*, under *Urban* the Second  
 Decree, *That whatever relating to Sacred Orders, did but*  
*seem to be acquired by Simony, should be held as void.* And  
*Pope Leo* the Ninth, ( says † *Petrus Damiani* his Contempo- † *Opuscul.*  
 rary ) did Re-ordain some Persons, who were *Simoniacs*, §  
 and so did *Pope Gregory* the Seventh Ordain in the Fifth Ro-  
 man Council; though at last the *Simony* was the same with  
 the *Hæresie* of *Investiture* formerly considered.

Such Thoughts also had the Church of *Rome* in former § 17.  
 days of such Bishops, who were removed from one See to a-  
 nother. For this was one ( and perhaps the most material )  
 Reason, why the Ordinations of *Pope Formosus* were not  
 allowed of, because having been formerly Bishop of *Porto*,  
 † he afterward accepted of the *Papacy*, ( contrary also to † *Sigebert*  
 his Promise, and Oath, that he would never see *Rome* ) the ad Ann.  
 first Person, who having been before a Bishop, was ever 900.  
 C 2 made

\* Chron.  
Pont. ad  
calc. Pla-  
tin. m. p.  
28.

† Mabilon.  
Iter Italic.  
p. 129.

made Pope, says \* Onuphrius. It is true, Pope John the Ninth did in two Councils at Rome, and Ravenna, acquit Formosus, and allow of his Ordinations, but Sergius the Third who succeeded John, again declared them void. ( And yet after this, Pope Gregory the Ninth having been Bishop of Ostium, was chosen Pope; † being since Canoniz'd, and Altars erected to his Memory ) This case of Pope Formosus was very Famous, as appears by the Books of Auxilius, in his Defence set out by Morinus, and Mabilon.

§ 18. The Orders also of Bishops made so *per saltum*, were of old invalidated in the Roman Church; Thus Pope \* Constantine was deposed by his Successor Pope Stephen, and what Bishops he had made were a new Consecrated, and that by an Order of a Roman Council, while the Pope had forgot, that among the Antients, St. Ambrose, Nectarius, and Eusebius of Casaria, and probably Synesius were of Lay-men suddenly made Bishops; and that Sergius Bishop of Ravenna, and Stephen Bishop of Naples were so Ordain'd in after times, as the † Pope Formosus pleads for himself; and at present a Deacon Cardinal is capable of being chosen Pope. This also was the case of the most learned Photius. Pope Adrian in his Epistle to Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, affirming, That, *because he had no Orders, he could give none*, and yet, we know not, whither St. Ambrose, &c. pass through all the inferiour Orders, or whither they were, as I suppose, Ordain'd Bishops *per saltum*.

† Auxil. l.  
2. d. ordi-  
nat. For-  
mosi. c. 4.  
Platin. in  
vlt. Ste-  
phani.

§ 19 Nor was this only the Opinion of those Ages, before the School-men had perplexed Divinity with their Distinctions; but \* Morinus a few years ago owns it, saying, *Those Popes seem to me praise worthy, who commanded those Orders to be reiterated, of which they did (but) doubt.* And if in the Opinion of those Popes and Councils, which I have cited, No Heretics, Schismatics, &c. could confer Orders, What Succession have they at Rome, when we can prove, that some of their Bishops were Heretics, others Schismatics, a  
third

\* De sacr.  
Eccl. Or-  
din. p. 3.  
exerc. 5 c.  
6. § 18.



third sort *Simoniacs*, &c? This I have the more largely proved, to shew that *Hæresie*, and *Schism* have been thought by the great Men of that *Church* to invalidate *Orders*, (ev'n by their *Popes*, and *Councils*) and if since that time their *Church* hath altered her Sentiments, Where is their unaltered *Tradition* and *Infallibility*, when in one Age *Heretical* Bishops have been thought incapable of Ordaining, and those who were Ordain'd by them, have been Re-ordain'd, while in another such *Orders* have been lookt on as valid, and the Re-ordination prohibited?

The veracity of Archbishop *Parker* (which this Gentleman, §. 2. questions) will not be so easily blasted, as he imagines, he being, as \* *Camden* justly styles him, *Vir* \* *Eliz. an.*  
*pius, eruditus, & moribus modestissimis, A Pious, Learned,* 1559.  
*and most Modest Man*, to which Character how a *Forger* of *Records* can lay claim, I cannot apprehend. The *Record* itself is in the *Registry* of the See of *Canterbury*, another Copy in *Bennet Colledge Library* at *Cambridge*, and the Letter, manner of Writing, and all other Circumstances are Convictive, that they are Genuine; and so are they believed to be by the Learned University of *Cambridge*, in their *Attestation* of this *Record* annext to Mr. *Brown's Latin* Sermons, in Vindication of the *Orders* of the *Church* of *England*: besides the Testimony, which Mr. *Camden* gives to the Matter of Fact in his *Elizabetha*, to omit other Writers; and yet it is a Rule in the Law, *Instrumenta publica potiora sunt testibus, That publick Deeds, and Records are better proof than Witnesses.* And I should be glad to see such *Records* of the *Ordinations* of many of their *Popes*, the manner how, the time when, and the Persons, by whom they were Consecrated; for I take it for granted, my Adversary would be hard put to it to produce them.

And herein I admire the good Providence of God, for had these *Records* been eras'd, or burnt, or fallen into the hands of Evil Men, how confident would such Men have been then?

then ? But Demonstration will not convince a *Sceptic*, tho' I would willingly know, how such *Records*, which we produce, can be justly run down with an odd, and ( almost ) incredible story of the *Nags-head Ordination*, first publish'd by *Neale*, ( who pretended to be present ) and by him told to some *English Fugitives*, by whom it was communicated to *Sacrobofco*, who made it known to the World ; while at that time there was a Law in being, ( 25 *Hen. 8. cap. 20.* ) that on the Penalty of a *Præmunire*, all Episcopal Ordinations should, as it was appointed, be made *with all due Circumstance*. And when Mr. *Mason* wrote his excellent Book, *De Ministerio Anglicano*, The Right Honourable *Charles Howard* Earl of *Nottingham* was alive, who was present at the Consecration of Archbishop *Parker*, at *Lambeth*, and bore Witness to the Truth of it ; ( a Testimony beyond that of a hundred *Neals* ) nor can a fairer proof of such a *Matter of Fact* be justly required. Nor ought our Adversaries be

\* Lib. 6. c.  
7.

too busie with this Fiction, while \* *Luitprandus*, an Author of no mean Esteem, and Name, says, That *Pope John* the Twelfth was Ordain'd a *Deacon* in a *Stable*, and that this was attested in a *Council* at *Rome*, before *Otho* the Emperor, by *John* the Bishop of *Narni*, and another *John* a *Cardinal Deacon*.

§ 22.

But, though the *Ordination* were made in *Lambeth Chapel*, yet that the Ordainers were three, nay more than three true Bishops, is denied by this Gentleman, § 2. Where I observe a fine, and dexterous turn of this my Adversary, which favors much of the *Jesuite*; for in the Paper there is no such word as *True*; it being added by the *Animadverter*, as an instance of his Integrity. But to gratifie him, I will now dare to say, *That they were three True Bishops, who Ordain'd Archbishop Parker*, if we take the word *True*, either, 1. For Orthodox, for if they believed all, that Christ and his Apostles delivered to the World, then were they as to Orthodoxy *True Bishops*, though this be not in-

indispensibly necessary by their own Concessions, since a *Hæretic may confer true and valid Orders*. Or, 2. If we call Men duly Consecrated *True Bishops*, they were *True Bishops*; for either they were rightly Ordain'd, or the *Papish Bishops* in *England* were not so; because he, who is Ordain'd according to the *Roman Pontifical*, will undoubtedly be acknowledged to be a true Bishop, and to have a Power (since the Character is indelible) to Ordain others: But the Bishops, who Consecrated Archbishop *Parker*, were Ordained by such, as were Consecrated according to the *Roman Pontifical*, which I shall prove.

The Ordainers of Archbishop *Parker* were, *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale*, and the *Suffragan* of *Bedford*. As for *Barlow*, we are assured, that he was successively Bishop of *St. Asaph*, *St. Davids*, *Bath* and *Wells*, and *Chichester*; that he was acknowledg'd a Bishop by all *Estates* of Men in the Kingdom; that for his *Temporalities* he did Homage to the King; that he sat in *Parliament* among the *Spiritual Lords*; that he exercised the Jurisdiction of a *Bishop*, and (what was the worst mark of all) alienated some of his Mannors to the Crown, though there be no particular *Register*, by whom he was Consecrated in *Henry* the Eighth time, \* more than in general, that he was made a Bishop in those Days. But this makes him not the less a Bishop, since there is no particular *Register* of *Stephen Gardiner's* Consecration, says † *Mr. Mason*.

§ 23.

\* Register.  
Cranmer.  
P. 179.

† P. 359.

§ 24.

But allowing *Barlow* to have been no Bishop, (as the contrary is very plain) yet there were *Three True Bishops*, besides him at Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration. For \* *John Scory* was Consecrated Bishop of *Chichester*, and † *Miles Coverdale* of *Exeter*, Aug. 30. 1551. by *Thomas* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *Nicolas* Bishop of *London*, and *John Suffragan* of *Bedford*; and † *John Hodgskins* was Consecrated *Suffragan* of *Bedford*, Dec. 9. 29. *Hen.* the Eighth, by *John* Bishop of *London*, *John* Bishop of *Rocheſter*, and

\* Registr.  
Cranmer.  
f. 334.

† lb. f. 204.

Ro-

*Robert Bishop of St. Asaph.* Now if it be denied, that this *Suffragan* was a true Bishop, I will take on me to prove it, when thereunto required, ( and the manner of his Ordination is a sufficient proof of it, for he was Ordain'd by three Bishops, as the Canons required ) and if he were not

\* Ib.f. 261. a true Bishop, Where is their own Succession? for \* *Thurlby*, who with others Ordain'd *Cardinal Pool*, was Consecrated by this *Suffragan* of *Bedford*: and that *Cranmer* was a true Bishop, I suppose no man will deny, he being made so in

† Ib.f. 321. *Hen.* the Eighth's time; and † *Ridley* was Consecrated Bishop of *Rocheſter*, Sept. 5. 1547. by *Henry Holbeck* of *Lincoln*, *John Suffragan* of *Bedford*, and *Thomas* Bishop of *Sidon*, besides the Archbishop *Cranmer*; all which were made Bishops in *Henry* the Eighth's time.

§ 25. And had not *Cranmer's*, and *Ridley's Orders* been good, What need was there of degrading them, before they were burnt for Religion under *Queen Mary*? And if so, then either you have no *Orders* in your own *Church*, or we have as good as you, since we derive our *Orders* from your Bishops, as they from the *Apostles*; and though we differ in very many points of Doctrine from our immediate Ordainers before the *Reformation*, as your Bishops do from the *Apostles*; yet you are of opinion, that *Hereſie* does not invalidate *Orders*. And at last this Gentleman seems to me to be convinc'd, that our *Orders* are good, since in his very *Title Page* he gives the Learned, and Venerable *Primate* of *Ireland*, *Brambal*, the Name of Bishop. And now I think, I have plainly proved, that Archbishop *Parker* was Ordain'd by Three, or more than three True Bishops; and my Adversary, if he will keep his Word, must be *Eternally Dumb*, ( as he promises, § 2. ) and will not scribble again, till he hath learnt to write with more Truth, and more Modesty.

§ 26. The third Paragraph treats of *Succession, Doctrinal, and Personal*, and tells us, That the *Arians* had not the *Succession* of *Doctrine*, (though it is well known, that the *Jesuite Petavius* hath

hath affirmed, That the Fathers before the *Nicene Council*, were of their Opinion, though that be not true, for the very word *ὁμοούσιος* (*Consubstantial*) was used by the Writers of the *Church* before that *Council*; and if the *Fathers* were of the Opinion of the *Arians*, then the *Arians* wanted not *Succession of Doctrine*; and if the *Belief* of the *Trinity* hath not its foundation in the *Holy Scriptures*, but in *Tradition*, as most of the *Romish Writers* say; Then they have both *Scripture*, and *Tradition* on their side ) but they had *Succession of Persons* ( which is a plain demonstration, That *Succession of Persons* is not of it self sufficient :) Nor is it enough to tell us, what they *pleaded*, they *believed*, but what they believed; for if they believed all things necessary to Salvation, ( and if they had done so, the want of *Succession Personal* would have done them no harm ) they were unjustly condemn'd at *Nice*, having a true *Succession of Doctrine*, ( for the *Council* could not make a new Article of Faith ) but if they did not believe all things necessary to Salvation, then were they justly condemn'd, and the *Succession of Persons* in such a Communion, is no proof of a *True Church*. For suppose the *Jewish Priesthood* had been continued down to our days by an uninterrupted *Succession*, would that have made them still the *True Church* of God without a *Succession of Doctrine* ?

I am sure, that the *Antient Church* would not acknowledge any Bishop to be a true Successor of the *Apostles*, till he had in his Letters to his Brethren, the Bishops of the *Catholic Church*, made a Confession of the True Faith. And this is agreeable to what \* *St. Irenæus* saith, That we are bound to obey \* *Li. 4. c. those Presbyters in the Church* ( exclusive of all others, as I understand the Father ) who have received together with their *Episcopal Succession*, the certain Gift of Faith, i. e. the same True Faith, which their Predecessors profess; and the same † Father † *Id. l. 3. c. 2. disproved the Heretics of that Age*, because they held not

*This I say, to shew, how too many of the Romish Church give away one of the Fundamentals of the Christian Belief to the Modern Arians, by an ill managing of the Cause, and not to give account of my Sentiments, which are contrary to the Socinian Dogmata; and there was need of my doing thus, to save my Adversary the trouble of another Innuendo.*

\* Depre-  
script.

the Doctrine, or Tradition revealed by the Apostles, and pre-  
ferr'd in the Church by the Bishops thereof in their several  
Successions: And then (cap. 3.) says, He can shew such a  
*Succession of Persons*, who so believed themselves, and so taught  
others; and therefore \* *Tertullian* requires, besides the Order  
of Bishops, that reaches to the Apostles, the *Consanguinity* of  
*Doctrine*, as he calls it, *i. e.* the Belief of the Apostolical Do-  
ctrine, to constitute a *True Church*: The Fathers generally  
proving their Assertions, not because such Men succeeded the  
Apostles, but because they taught no other Doctrine, than what  
those Infallible men delivered to the World. And I wonder  
this Gentleman calls so eagerly on us for an unquestion'd Ca-  
talogue of our Bishops in the Order of their *Succession*, while it  
is more than they can shew of their own *Popes*; for either one,  
or all their Catalogues are true; not all, for they contradict  
one another; and if one only be true, I would fain see that one  
so testified, that all their Authors acquiesce in it.

§ 28.

† Controv.  
de Ecclef.  
in se qu. 4.  
art. 2. Ex-  
pos. Artic.  
membr. 5.

And their Learned † *Stapleton* doth acknowledge, " That  
" as a lawful Succession is a mark of the True Church, so to  
" make a lawful Succession, it is requisite, not only that a Bi-  
" shop be lawfully chosen, but that he hold the Faith his Pre-  
" decessors did. And if our Adversaries of the *Romish Church*  
would disprove us in this point, by shewing that we deny a-  
ny Article of Faith, which the Primitive Church held, or hold  
any Article which they denied, we should be obliged to them;  
but this I despair of, till I can see (as to other Books of that  
kind, so) a sober and judicious Answer, as the Work deserves,  
to the *first part of the Catholic Ballance*, the Author of which  
shews, that what is believed by our Church, is all that was  
required by the Antient Church to be believed, and that the  
*Romanists* are the Innovators.

§ 29.

But I perceive my Adversary brings in the *Arians*, and the  
*Council of Nice*, either to shew us, that *General Councils* can  
make *Articles of Faith*, (which the wise men of his Commu-  
nion deny) or to compare the *Protestants* to the *Arians*, and  
the *Trent Council* to the *Nicene*; while that at *Nice* was a most  
vene-



venerable Assembly of the greatest part of the Christian Bishops in the *Roman* Empire, Men famous for Learning, Piety, and Miracles, summon'd by the *Great Constantine*, and who determin'd every thing according to the Word of God ; " While " that at *Trent* ( as the \* *Animadverter on the 8 Theses* well ob- " serves ) was a Synod, wanting the greatest part of the Chri- " stian Bishops unjustly excluded ; and consisting partly of " Persons unjustly introduc't, partly of those, who had been " first bribed with Money, and promises of Church Prefer- " ment, or pre-engaged by Oaths to comply with the Usur- " pations of a pretended Spiritual Monarch : And so awed, that they durst not determine, what was most right, and agree- able to their own Sentiments, Reason, Antiquity, and Scripture, because not allowed of at *Rome*, as appears plainly, in that the Bishops, who at the same time were Judges, as well as Parties, could not be allowed to assert the Divine Right of their Office.

P. 62.

We are told, § 4. That the *Church of England doth not pretend to Infallibility*, and we own it, and say, That the *Church of Rome* doth but pretend to it, for she hath it not ; nor are their best Writers agreed, where to fix it. As to *Succession of Doctrines*, we have proved, we have it, and for *Succession of Persons*, if they have any, we have that also, ( for whatever they can justly say, to prove, that they have true Bishops, that we also can say, to prove, that we have true Bishops, having this besides to say for our selves, that our form of Ordaining is much more agreeable to Antiquity than theirs ) for *Cranmer* was duly Consecrated, and received the *Pall* from the *Pope* ; and from him, and others of his Character do our Bishops derive their *Succession*, as he, and they from their Predecessors. And since this Gentleman requires me to shew him the *Time of the Foundation of our Church* ; if he means of our Doctrine, at what time they came into the World ; We say, that it was delivered to the *Church* by Christ, and his Apostles, and is contained in the *Holy Scriptures*, where their Doctrines have no Foundation ; if as to the Time, when she first became a *Church*, we have as good Authority, as they have, that ever *St. Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*,

§ 30.

that the *Church of Britain* was founded before that on the *Seven Hills*, and so is her elder Sister. And in this Church so founded, the Government Establish'd was *Episcopal*, for I suppose, my Adversary will not undertake to shew, that the *Papal Supremacy* over this *Church* was cœvovous with it ; for antiently the Bishops of *Rome* had no Authority here, this *Church*, as many others, being ( *Αυτοκρατορ* ) Independent on any other Jurisdiction, which Rights were confirmed by the *Nicene \* Council*, ( which Ordains, that every great Bishop should confine himself to his district ) and by the *Ephesine Council*, which prohibited in other Bishops the like Usurpations, as the *Patriarch of Antioch* would have made on the privileges of the *Cyprian Church*.

Can. 6.

6 31.

Nor is his 5. § of more weight ; for the *Western Fathers* ( the *African Church* being reckoned among the *Latins* ) instant'd in the Succession of the Bishop of *Rome*, not but that 1. Other *Churches* had the same Succession, and the *Greeks, Nestorians, Jacobites*, and other *Heretics* of the *East*, as your *Church* ( over charitably ) calls them, retain a *Personal Succession* to this day. Nor, 2. But that a *Succession* of Doctrine was held necessary, as well as of *Persons*, as I have already proved. But perhaps this Gentleman hath Reason ( as well as his Brethren ) to contend earnestly for the *Succession* of *Persons*, while they want the *Succession* of *Doctrines*, notwithstanding all their pretences to Antiquity ; their Arguments on this subject having been so baffled already, that the very *New Controvertists*, the *Men of Assurance*, have given up the Cause, and by their declining to Answer so many Excellent Books, as have been written on the particular points, have shewn, they can say nothing for themselves from Genuine Antiquity ; nor is he ignorant, that many of their *Popes*, in whom the *Personal Succession* was fix'd, have not kept up the *Succession* of *Doctrines*, that *Pope Liberius* was an *Arian* ; *Honorius* a *Monothelite*, *Vigilius* a Defender of the *Tria Capitula*, which the Fifth *General Council* condemn'd, to omit the later *Popes*, \* who, as *Barnes*, one of their own Writers, asserts, since the *Council of Constance* are all *Heretics*,

\* Romano  
Cathol.  
pacif. Sect.  
3. p. 49.  
53. Ed.  
Oxon.



( unless perhaps we may except *Pope Adrian the Sixth* ) because they pertinaciously affirm, That a *Pope is not subject to a General Council*, contrary to the determinations of that *Council*.

§ 32.

I am sorry to see him falter, as he does, § 6. when he distinguishes between *Baptism*, and the *Power of Baptizing*, for this will not help him out; the meaning of the *Aphorism* being no more, but this, That *no man can confer that on another, which he hath not himself*; and therefore, if he, who is not Ordain'd cannot Ordain, then he, who is not Baptized, cannot Baptize; now the first is your Assertion, the second ours, and both deduced from the same *Aphorism*. And so did the Antients argue, so did *St. Cyprian*, and *Firmilian*, &c. " That no Man could Baptize, but " he who had the Holy Ghost; now the Holy Ghost never descending on a Schismatic (much less on an Infidel) therefore " the Schismatic, whenever he did Baptize, the Baptism which " he gave, was none in their esteem. And such were the Arguments about Orders in their own *Church*, as I have out of *Auxilius*, *P. Nicolas*, and others proved, *Seet. 12, 15, 18*. " And whereas my Adversary would by an *Innuendo* from my " instance of the Baptism of an Infidel allow'd among them, deduce my Belief, that Laymen might Ordain; it was very far from my meaning, nor can any such thing, without very hard straining, be deduc'd from my words, which I mean, not as a plea for our Orders (for we have much better) but as an argument that what they object against us, lights heavier on themselves; for if Baptism given by an Infidel, be not Baptism (as it is none, if the Maxim be true) then probably more than a few of their Communion are no Christians.

§ 34.

In the seventh *Seet.* I am called upon to prove a Negative, and that shews my Antagonist's extraordinary *acumen*, whereas it properly becomes him to prove, " That our Saviour did " institute a Form of Words, did deliver to the Apostles the " Holy Vessels (as the *matter* of their Priesthood) and gave " them Power to offer Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead; and I would thank him heartily for shewing me a Copy of that Form of Words; while I cannot find any thing of that kind in

in the Holy Scriptures, nor genuine Antiquity ; but perhaps my Adversary hath seen some old *Ritual*, or *Ordinal*, which hath 'scapt the diligence of *Morinus*, *Cardinal Bona*, *Thomasius*, and *Mabillon*, the great Searchers into such Writings ; and if he hath been so happy, for a sight of any such Writing I would also heartily thank him : for till then, I, who cannot in matters of Fact believe any thing, but my Eyes, or unquestion'd Witnesses, am of the opinion, That *that which does not appear, is in the same case with the things, which have no being* : and this, I suppose, a sufficient Answer to that Paragraph.

§ 35.

But to please my Adversary, I shall tell him, that more than a few Men of their own *Church*, say, That our Blessed Saviour did not *deliver the Patin*, and *Chalice*, nor Institute any *peculiar Words*, i. e. did not Institute the particular *Matter* and

\* Vid. *Mo-*  
*rin.* Part 3.  
P. 6. &c.

*Form of Orders*. So says \* *Præpositus Atrebas*, S. J. (his particular Name we know not) " That our Saviour Instituted *no Matter and Form of Orders*, but in general, but that he left it " to the Authority of the Apostles, and the Prudence of the " *Church*, and that for this reason several Churches had several " Usages, each chusing to itself such a visible sign, as might im- " ply the delivery of the power, which *Orders* do confer, and " such a form of words, as might be most significant ; and so also " says *Isambertus*, (who proves it by the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and the fourth *Council of Carthage*) and *Philippus Gamachæus*, and *Hallier* ; and *Becanus* a *Jesuite* says, that *Imposition of hands* was the *matter* of *Orders* instituted by *Christ*, but the *Council of Florence* assigned another *matter* (*viz.* the delivery of the Sacred Vessels) which their Church *makes use of* ; and *Pope Innocent* the 4th says, That the *Apostles* used no other *Form* (for that word the *Pope* uses, tho' I am blamed for it) but *Imposition of Hands*, and *Prayer* ; nor do the old *Pontificals* mention any such *Matter*, and *Form of Order*, as the Modern ones do.

§ 36.

If therefore it appears not, that our Blessed Saviour did ordain the *Roman Matter*, and *Form*, to be of the *Essence of Orders*, nor does it appear that the *Church* had ever power to make any thing *essential* to a Sacrament (as the *Romanists* make *Or-*  
*ders*)

ders) which *Christ* the Head of the *Church* hath not made so I would fain know by what Authority the *Roman Church* hath made this alteration? And if the Authority be just, whither other *Churches*, have not as good Authority to stick to the Apostolical Practice, as they to alter it? And if so, With what Charity, or Justice, do they condemn those other *Churches*, who differ from them in this point? This Argument swayed so much with the Learned *Leo Allatius*, *Lucas Holstenius*, and *Johannes Morinus*, that it served by their Recommendation, to soften the *Congregation of Cardinals*, and incline them to better thoughts of the *Orders* of the *Greek Church*. Nay, further, if our *Form of Ordination* be not disagreeable to that which our Saviour instituted, the Apostles practised, the Ancient *Roman Church* herself used, and to which, to this day, the *Eastern Churches* oblige themselves, by what Power is this alteration made?

For it is a good observation of *Alexander* and *Bonaventure*, (two of the Elder Schoolmen) that, *Quæ ab homine Ordinata*, &c. "Whatsoever things are by Men ordain'd, and establish'd, may "be changed by Men, but what God hath instituted, cannot "without his leave be altered; if therefore our Blessed Saviour instituted no particular *Matter*, and *Form* of *Orders* to be constantly used, but left it to the determination of every *Church*, then the *Church of England* hath as much Right to appoint a *Matter* and *Form* for *Orders*, as the *Church of Rome*, (so that her proceedings herein be not contrary to our Saviour's mind) and so far hath our Mother *Church* been from thwarting our Saviour's, or the Apostles Institution, that it to this day uses the same *Matter* which they did, *viz. Imposition of Hands*, (according to the Custom of the *Jews*, who by that Rite Consecrated a *Levite*, and Constituted a *Magistrate*, as in after Ages it was used in the Creation of a *Rabbi*) and tho' the present *Form*, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost*, &c. be new, (for \* *Morinus* ingenuously confesses, "That Antiquity was wholly ignorant of that *Form*, that the Ancient Schoolmen, and among them *Aquinas*, mention it not,

§ 37.

\* De Sacr.  
Eccles. Or-  
dinat. Part  
3. Exerc. 2.  
Ca. 1. 2. p. 22.

" that

" that it came into the *Latin Church*, not much above 400 years ago, and that there is no such thing in the *Greek Church*, (nor the *Churches* of the *East*, to this day) yet our *Church* retains it, the *Form* implying also a *Power* to Consecrate the Holy Sacrament, with this difference, we (if I understand our *Ordinal* aright) only invoke the Holy Spirit, that it may descend on the Person Ordained; while the *Roman Church* avers, That the *Form* of Words doth confer the Holy Spirit; between which two Propositions, I think, there is a wide difference.

§ 38. After this my Adversary makes himself very pleasant with an Omission of the Transcriber of the *Plain Answer*, &c. as if the Fault were the *Country Minister's*, and that for that reason he was *no Divine*, or so sorry a one, as not to know the difference between *Matter* and *Form*; but the Correct Copy now printed is an Answer to that Objection, and so all his Outcries vanish into soft Air. Tho, I suppose, some of our Adversaries, when they object to us, That we want a *due Form* of Orders, mean, That we are not duly ordained *Priests*, (as our *Church* calls the *Office of Ordination*, *The Form of Ordering Bishops*, &c.) and under that general Head accuse us, That we have neither the true *Matter* (the delivery of the Sacred Vessels) nor the true *Form* of Words.

§ 39. But had I in that fourth Section only mentioned *Imposition of Hands*, yet without begging his Charity, the Words could not well have been understood of that *Imposition of Hands* without the *Prayers* annext, (the very delivery of the *Patin* and *Chalice* among them, having an immediate relation to the Power given thereby, to make, as they call it, the *Body of Christ*; for else, why are not those Sacred Vessels given to the Deacons at their *Ordination*, who, tho' they cannot consecrate, were allowed anciently to distribute the *Sacramental Elements*?) and when the Ancients define a Sacrament to be a *visible Form* (or *Sign*) of an *invisible Grace*; which *Form*, they tell us, is the *Species*, or thing, that is perceived by the Senses; I suppose, they were not so curious in their Distinctions, as the Moderns, nor had they reason. And

And whereas this Gentleman makes so great ado about *Matter* and *Form* in every Sacrament, according to the Language of the later *School-men*, he, who hath been conversant with the Fathers, and other ancient Authors, cannot but much admire their way of expressing themselves; for in the Writings of those Venerable Men there is not a word of the *Matter* and *Form* of Sacraments, as the Men of this Age understand the Words; the *Modern School-men* blending all Divinity with the Philosophy of *Aristotle*, who making *Matter* and *Form* the constituent Parts of Natural things, was followed by those who applied the Distinction to all Sacraments, which are Spiritual things. Near about a thousand years after our Blessed Saviour's Birth, did the Philosophy of *Aristotle* prevail in the Christian School, (and \* *Hettinger* affirms, that it came out of *Syria* into *Europe*) but for a hundred years after that, we hear nothing of this Distinction: And *Morinus* says, That *Guill. Antistiodorensis*, about the Year 1215, was the first who made use of it; tho, as the same Learned Man says, should we apply all the *Physical* Properties of *Matter* and *Form* to the Sacraments, we should fall into many Absurdities. The Fathers tell us of the *Sign* and the *Thing signified*; of the *Sacrament*, and the *Res Sacramenti*; of the *Sacrament*, and the *Word of God*, that makes it so, as *S. Austin* hath it; but not a word is there in their Writings of due *Matter* and *Form*, as the Words are now understood; their Disputes being about the *Power of the Ordainer*, and consequently about the *Character of the Ordained*: And what are the later *School-men*, that they should be prefer'd to the *Fathers*?

And since the *School-men* now adays give us a Body of Divinity, and help us to understand Articles of Faith, upon inquiry we shall find them to be a *Classis* of *Divines*, who have resolv'd to make a League between *Aristotle* and *Christ*, and to give the preference to the *Philosopher*, by forcing the Christian Doctrines to suit his Notions, (tho, by the by, *Transubstantiation* will never be brought to agree to the Principles of *Aristotle*) and if a Mans Wit be not apt to distin-

guish, or find Differences, or rather, if any one would shift when he should answer, let him study the *School-men*, for they can *split a Cummin-seed*, says the wise \* Lord Bacon; and the same wise Man says †, "That when St. Paul, in the 1 Tim. 6. 20. (according to the Vulgar Translation) advises Timothy to avoid the profane novelties of words, and oppositions of science falsely so called, that the Words were a Prophecy of the time to come, assigning two Marks of suspected and falsified Science: 1. The Novelty of Terms; and, 2. The Strictness of Positions, which of necessity induce Oppositions.—Which kind of degenerate Learning, as that Great Man continues his Character, chiefly reigns among the *School-men*. And were I to give Instances of their Vanity, it would not be unpleasant; but I forbear, when I have given you account, "That in the Council of \* Florence, when one of the Learned Men of that Synod had made a Speech, and in it frequently quoted Aristotle for his Authority, a Prince of Iberia then present called Syropulus unto him, and ask'd him, to what purpose he so often quoted Aristotle, saying, That he should have quoted St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Basil, St. Gregory the Divine, St. Chrysostome, &c. And thus, says my Author, did the Barbarian shew himself the better Divine of the two.

§ 42. I never supposed, that our Bishops were either *Heretics*, or *Schismatics*, as this Gentleman says, *Seft. 9.* being ready to prove them to be neither; but to say, That such Bishops have not lost their indelible Character, and so can confer Orders, is to urge their own Assertions against themselves: But his Talent lies in *Imuendo's*, and few good Men make use of such Arguments. Nor do I envy him his peculiar Faculty of denying, that the Sun is up at Noon, when he rebukes me for saying, *That the Greeks have been sent from the Seminary at Rome, to be Ordained by Heretical Bishops in the East:* For this also their own Authors vouch for.

§ 43. Thomas à Jesu, in his Treatise *de Gentium omnium salute procuranda*, printed at Antwerp, An. 1613. with Approbation, thus begins the Sixth Book, the First Chapter; *Primò, Viris conversionis Græcorum studiosissimis, &c.* "First of all, It seemed most expedient to those Men, who are most studious of the Conversion of the Greeks, that it may be granted to the Scholars of the Greek College at Rome, That, when they return into their Country, they may be Ordained by Greek Bishops (tho Schismatics) in whose Diocess they live; and that without this Method, there is little or no hopes of converting that Nation. (And Gerganus Bishop of Arta complains much, in his Preface to his Catechism, of such Men, who did the true

\* Essays,

§ 8.

† Advanc.  
of Learn.  
lib. 1.

\* Syropul.

Hist. Conc.  
Florent.

§ 9. c. 12.

p. 270.



true Greeks much mischief.) And he who will be at the pains of reading the Account which the Learned \* *Leo Allatius* gives of the College erected at Rome by Pope Gregory the Thirteenth, will there see many Instances of this nature, many made Archbishops and Bishops in Greece and Russia; who came from the Seminary at Rome: Of which number, *Nicephorus Melissenus* was made by *Raphael* Patriarch of Constantinople, Metropolitane of Paros and Naxos; *Josaphat Azales* was first made a Monk of St. Basil's Order, and then a Priest; as *Ignatius Mindon* was made the Rector of the Patriarchal Church at Pera.

\* De Con-  
sens. l. 3.  
c. 7. p. 986,  
&c.

Among whom I shall give him one Instance beyond all Exceptions, out of a Letter of the Reverend Dr. *Basire*, who was upon the Place, and saw *Paisius Ligarides* (*Leo Allatius*, p. 996. calls him *Pantaseo*) who had been bred at Rome, made, Ann. 1652. Nov. 14. Metropolitane of Gaza, by the Patriarch of Constantinople, then at Jerusalem; Dr. *Basire* being present at the Ceremony, while *Ligarides* at his Consecration made a Confession of his Faith according to the Belief of the Greek Church, trampling under his Feet a Picture representing a City on seven Hills, with an Eagle bicepted soaring over it, which all Persons present took to represent Rome.

\$ 44.

And now I am near the end of my Task, which will soon be dispatcht, when I have consider'd his Tenth Section, about Intention. What the Intention of our Church is, in conferring Orders, is well known, for an openly declared Intention cannot be hid, while no Man can be sure of the Intention of a private Priest; or if a Man may be equally sure, I should be glad to see him prove, that all their Bishops (and among them those whom they call *Infallible*) intend- ed to ordain every Person, to whom they gave Orders; for we have been informed to the contrary of some great Men of their Communion; nor are their Schoolmen agreed, what sort of Intention is requisite to give being to a Sacrament. A \* late Writer of that sort, gives us an Account of their Disputes; Whether an Intention to use the External Action, which is appointed, or an Internal Intention to do as the Church appoints, be requisite: Whether a Heretic, or Pagan, who have not true Faith, can have the Intention of doing what the Church doth, and of making true Sacraments? Whether the Intention of doing what the Church requires, must be limited to the Roman Church, or may be meant of any other true Church? Whether the Minister ought to have this Intention, while he is pronouncing all the Words, or only in the beginning or end of them? Whether it be requisite, that this Intention be only habitual, or virtual only, or actual? Whether a mistake in the Intention, as to Person, or Sex, invalidate the Sacrament, as if a Priest intending to Baptize the Son of Peter, do Baptize the Son of Paul, whether that Baptism be not null? Whether he, who intended only to Consecrate Ten Wafers, and there were Eleven under the Corporal, did Consecrate the Eu- charist

\$ 45.

\* Agudius  
de Sacram.  
part 1 c. 5.  
p. 56, &c.

charist or not? (i.e. Whether One of the Eleven, or all be unconfecrated?) Whether, when a Priest intends to do accordingly to Christ's Institution, but hath no Intention to do as the Church determines, he doth Consecrate a valid Sacrament, or not? Whether together with the Priest's Intention, an Orthodoxy of Faith, and Holiness of Life be required? And at last, Whether a Bishop, when he gives Orders, and does openly, and expressly protest, That he does not intend to Ordain any Excommunicate, or Irregular Person, and afterward ignorantly does Lay Hands on such a Person, whether the Orders be valid? To which Agudius answers, That the Bishop does not by that Protestation intend so to give Orders to those, who are present, that he may exclude those who are under Censures, for such an Intention were Sacrilegious; but that only he intends to prohibit such, that they may not offer themselves, and that he will not Ordain an Excommunicate Person willingly; but if such Persons without his knowledge be Ordain'd, he hath an absolute Intention of Ordaining them. Which is a very pretty Distinction; and by these Disputes let any Man judge, how they are assured of the Intention of any of their Priests, or Bishops.

§ 46.

\* Art. 36.

After all which it would seem to me wonderful, that the Gentleman is so averse to our Orders, while other great Men of his Church are not so unjust; \* Santa Clara in his Paraphrase on our Articles, allows our Priesthood to be valid; and of this opinion also is Father Walsh, in his Second and Third Letters to the Bishop of Ferni, and because it might be objected, that both Santa Clara, and Walsh, were born in the King of England's Dominions, and may have a kindness for their Country, I shall mention one more, a Stranger, † Cusseting, a German, who being at first a Protestant, afterward changed his Name and Religion; he came into England, Anno 1608, to observe the state of our Church, and at last gives her this Testimony, That by reason of her Catholic Ordinations, continued by a perpetual Series of Bishops, and lawful Succession of Pastors received from the Church, he durst not call her Heretical, but only Schismatical. And perhaps my Adversary, were he a Lover of the Peace of the Church of GOD, would be inclined to side with such moderate Men; but I cannot expect it, while I know what Order he is of: to all which I shall subjoyn, That if our Orders be void, and every Bishop, and Priest among us be not a Clergyman, I desire this Gentleman to tell me, By what Right Mr. St. holds his Vicarage, to which the Law says no Man shall be Instituted and Inducted, but he who is a Priest?

† De desperat. Calvini causâ. c. 11. p. 108.

§ 47.

And if after all this my Adversary be not satisfied, I desire him to Answer Mr. Mason, Archbishop Brambal, Dr. Burnet, or Mr. Brown's late Printed Sermons on that Subject; and when he hath gone through that Task, I shall probably find him some new Work. I am,

July 1st. 1688.

S I R,

TOWNS, &c.